Message

From: d'Almeida, Carolyn K. [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=9EC4401AFA1846DD93D52A0DDA973581-CDALMEID]
Sent: 12/20/2016 5:53:24 PM
To: Wayne Miller [Miller.Wayne@azdeq.gov]; 'steve@uxopro.com' [steve@uxopro.com]
CC: Davis, Eva [Davis.Eva@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: soils data
Attachments: ST012-Soil-121616.pdf

Forwarding you Eva's comment

From: Davis, Eva
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2016 7:50 AM
To: d'Almeida, Carolyn K. <dAlmeida.Carolyn@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: soils data

Hi Carolyn –

Looking at the soils data, and some of the data they provided previously, if I didn't know better, I'd say that they are purposely messing with the sampling. In the soil sample results attached here, the footnotes admit that at least for one of the samples (LSZ53, 169 ft), was not preserved adequately. Thus benzene and other volatile compounds could not be analyzed for, although you can tell by the detections of less volatile compounds that the volatile compounds should have been present. The lack of benzene detections in samples LSZ61 35 ft and 215 ft also looks suspect – the GRO detections indicate benzene and other volatiles are present. I believe the differences in composition between these 6 samples is greater than we have seen before.

Another thing that raises a red flag is the fact that they reported a very low benzene concentration in LSZ47 – a soil sample from 214 ft showed benzene < 10,000 ug/kg, and the two groundwater samples were 3.7 and 6.7 ug/l, but less than a month later they found 2.11 ft of LNAPL in the well. Makes the analytical data suspect. We may need to have additional oversight of the field work, maybe we need to see the reports from the labs to see if there are other irregularities – just giving you a heads up now.

Eva

From: Davis, Eva
Sent: Monday, December 19, 2016 2:02 PM
To: d'Almeida, Carolyn K. <dAlmeida.Carolyn@epa.gov>; d p <DPope@css-dynamac.com>
Subject: soils data